

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested, on the reasons Applicant respectfully submits by this paper.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7 are the only claims currently pending in this application. Claim 6 is canceled without prejudice, and without disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 1-2 and 4-7 are hereby amended. No new matter has been added.

The Office Action states that claims 1-2, 4, 5, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103, asserting the claims are unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,907,314 (“*Negishi*”) in view of Publication WO 01/54108 A1 (“*Liang*”).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 1 and 7 recite intermediate discharging of a selected row n, storing the charge, then *fully discharging* the selected row n and, *after this full discharging*, starting an intermediate charging of the row n + x with the charge stored from the row n.

The Office Action improperly reads the claim 1 recitation of fully discharging the row n to require only discharging the row to *an intermediate voltage level*. See Office Action at page 6, last five lines. Applicant respectfully submits the Examiner's interpretation is not consistent with the broadest reasonable meaning of the claim 1 language.

Applicant respectfully submits that the broadest reasonable meaning of “fully discharging” is its plain meaning, to a person of ordinary skill in the art which is: a discharging, i.e., a draining off of charge, until reaching a *zero* charge state, relative

to a reference voltage (i.e., ground). Applicant's specification at, for example, page 3, lines 29-30, shows the meaning to be commensurate with this plain meaning.

Applicant further submits that the broadest reasonable meaning of "after," in the context of Applicant's disclosure, is its plain meaning, which is: subsequent in time. Referring to Applicant's Fig. 4, an exemplar of this meaning is the charging of row n+1 starts at T5, which is after row n is fully discharged. Applicant's specification, at page 2, lines 27-33, further describes this timing feature of Applicant's invention as avoiding a cross-talk phenomenon that may arise from concurrent charging or discharging of multiple rows.

The Office Action admits that *Negishi*, the primary reference on which the Examiner relies, lacks the above-described claim 1 charging of a capacitor to an intermediate voltage level with energy from a selected row n, followed by charging another row n+x using the stored charge from the capacitor, "after the row voltage of row n is fully discharged." Office Action at p. 3, lines 7-11.

The Office Action cites *Liang* as having such a teaching. Applicant respectfully submits that *Liang* does not disclose or suggest such subject matter.

Liang teaches a complementary and *concurrent* discharging and charging of a pair of opposite polarity rows which, in addition to the concurrent discharging/charging, does *not* completely discharge a capacitor of one row prior to charging another row. More particularly, *Liang* teaches first *concurrently* discharging each of the pair of oppositely charged row into two respectively opposite capacitors, Cn and Cp, followed by disconnecting each from its respective capacitor,

followed by *connecting the two rows together to neutralize each other to their average voltage*, then connecting each of the rows to the opposite capacitor to initiate a *concurrent* opposite charging, followed by a *concurrent* completion of the opposite charging. *Liang* therefore adds nothing to *Negishi* relative to Applicant's claimed invention.

The combination of *Negishi* and *Liang* therefore lacks the discharging feature of Applicant's claim 1 and 7 invention and, further, it lacks the discharging/charging timing feature of Applicant's claim 1 and 7, invention.

Applicant

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that applying the legal standards for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 to the differences between Applicant's claims 1 and 7 and the scope and content of the prior art, namely, *Negishi* and *Liang*, establishes the claims as patentable over these references.

Applicant, for the foregoing reasons, respectfully urges reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 7, and of dependent claims 2, 4 and 5 as well.

Applicant further and respectfully requests that the Examiner, if any rejections are maintained under 35 U.S.C. § 103, identify where in *Negishi* and *Liang* /or any other prior art relied upon, the Examiner finds disclosure of all the claim elements and of subject matter supporting the rationale the Examiner identifies under the MPEP § 2141 guidelines for modifying and combining the prior art to achieve the claim(s) rejected.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections/objections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone; the Examiner is asked to contact the agent overseeing the application file, David A. Cordeiro, of NXP Corporation at (408) 474-9057.

In the event that the fees submitted prove to be insufficient in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge our Deposit Account Number 50-0578 and please credit any excess fees to such Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.

Date: April 6, 2009


Terry W. Kramer
Registration No.: 41,541

Please direct all correspondence to:
Corporate Patent Counsel
NXP Intellectual Property & Standards
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41
San Jose, CA 95131
CUSTOMER NO.: 65913